

REMARKS

The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection

Claims 10 - 18 remain pending.

Claim Objections

Claims 10, 12, 13 and 17 stand objected to because of certain informalities set forth in numbered paragraph 2 on pages 2 and 3 of the Action.

It is submitted that these claims have now been amended to satisfy the various objections of the Examiner set forth in numbered paragraph 2.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 10 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Spencer U. S. patent No. 5,826,261.

For the reasons set forth hereafter, it is submitted that claims 10 – 18, as now amended, all patentably distinguish over the prior art.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 11-17 were only objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but were stated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 11-17 remain dependent from claim 10 since it is believed amended claim 10 from which they depend is now allowable.

Patentability of the Claims

The courtesy of the Examiner at the interview with Applicant's undersigned attorney on November 13, 2006 is greatly appreciated. The substance of the interview is believed adequately set forth in the Interview Summary issued by the Examiner at the conclusion of the interview and in the remarks which follow.

Claims 10 and 18 have been amended to more clearly define Applicant's invention in accordance with the discussions with the Examiner at the interview. It is believed that claims 10 and 18 now clearly set forth the novel steps of Applicant's invention in a comprehensive matter.

Applicant's invention as defined in amended claim 10 is directed to a computer implemented service of searching documents wherein servers comprising document databases and programs to manipulate the database are dispersed over a network and a client connected to the servers performs a document search. The computer implemented service provides a document search method comprising the steps of:

- (1) making a first search input of a set of keywords, fragments of a document or any desired set of documents to a first document database;

- (2) conducting a first search of said first document database based on said first search input;

- (3) retrieving at least one document as a result of said first search;

- (4) inputting said at least one retrieved document to said first document base;

- (5) making a weighted term list from said input of said at least one retrieved document to said first document database, the weight of each term reflecting the importance of the term in the first document database;

- (6) automatically performing a search of a second document database based on said weighted term list from said first database;

- (7) wherein said weighted term list is used as a second search input that performs said search of said second document database and wherein each term in

the term list is weighted considering the importance of the term both in the first document database and the second document database, and the weight is used to calculate the relevance of each document of the second document database, and

(8) displaying the results on a display unit.

Claim 18 is similar but is directed to steps employed by a client.

By this invention, the client can obtain a set of documents in the second document database which relates to an arbitrary set of key documents in the first document database, so that network traffic is reduced to a small amount without complicated system. Spencer does not teach this invention. Spencer discloses a system and method for querying multiple, distributed databases and merging the retrieved result.

Spencer teaches a system and method for querying multiple, distributed databases with four phases, 1) query analysis, 2) collection synchronization, 3) query execution, and 4) results merging (col. 4 lines 58-67).

1) Query Analysis

The user's query is sent from a client computer to each of the multiple document databases. Each document database determines the terms related to the query that are likely to contribute significant error to the document scores resulting from the query if their IDS (inverse document frequency) values are left unsynchronized. As a result of the query analysis, the client computer receives from each of the document databases the first list of terms, along with their error contribution weights. (col. 5 lines 1-36, col. 12 lines 49 – col. 14 line 42).

2) Collection Synchronization

The client aggregates terms it receives from the multiple document databases that could contribute significant errors and ranks them on the basis of their error contribution weights. The client obtains from each document database information about the local relative significance of each of the significant terms and determines a global relative significance of each term with respect to all the databases. The client computes a global relative significance of each term as the global frequency of the term in all of the databases. (col. 5 line 37 – col. 6 line 5m col. 14 line 52 – col. 15 line 50)

3) Query Execution

The client instructs each document database to execute the query using the newly determined global relative significance information. Each document database produces from the query a ranked list of documents that satisfy the query, given the global IDF's. This ranked list is sent back to the client computer. (col. 6 lines 6-23, col. 15 lines 51~)

4) Result Merging

The client has a list of ranked results from each document database. The client merges these lists and re-ranks the results without further computation to produce a list of documents that globally satisfy the query. The client then displays the document list to the user (col. 6, lines 24-36).

The difference between the present invention and Spencer

The present invention performs database search from first database to second database by making a query of documents from the search result of first database and searching second database related to the query documents of first

database. Thus, the present invention is a search from one database to another database.

On the other hand, Spencer teaches that user's query is sent to each of the multiple database, each database computes local relative significance of a term, the client computes a global relative significance of each term by being provided the term from each database, and client merges lists of ranked results from each document database that globally satisfy the query. Therefore, the method of Spencer is one for merging search results from a multiple of databases. The method of Spencer is not a method for searching from one database to another database as in applicants' invention.

The method of Spencer thus is quite different from the present invention and therefore the present invention as now claimed is patentable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Mattingly, Stanger, Malur & Brundidge, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (referencing attorney docket no. NIT-163-02).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Gene W. Stockman
Registration No. 21,021

U.S. Application No. 10/075,283

Attorney Docket: NIT-163-02

GWS/cmd
(703) 684-1120